

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

15) No.: M-07-5944 SC
16 **In Re CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)**)
17 **ANTITRUST LITIGATION**) MDL NO. 1917
18 _____)
19 This Document Relates to:) **[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING**
20 ALL ACTIONS) **DEFENDANTS' JOINT MOTION TO**
21) **CERTIFY ORDER FOR**
22) **INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL**
23 _____)
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)

1 The Joint Motion to Certify Order for Interlocutory Appeal filed by Defendants
2 Panasonic Corporation of North America, MT Picture Display Co., Ltd., Panasonic
3 Corporation (f/k/a Matsushita Electric Industrial Co), Samsung SDI America, Inc., Samsung
4 SDI Co., Ltd., Samsung SDI (Malaysia) Sdn. Bhd., Samsung SDI Mexico S.A. de C.V.,
5 Samsung SDI Brasil Ltda., Shenzhen Samsung SDI Co. Ltd., Tianjin Samsung SDI Co., Ltd.,
6 Samsung Electronics Co., Samsung Electronics America, Inc., LG Electronics, Inc., LG
7 Electronics USA, Inc., LG Electronics Taiwan Taipei Co., Ltd., Philips Electronics North
8 America Corporation, Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V., Philips Electronics Industries
9 Ltd., Philips Consumer Electronics Co., Philips Electronics Industries (Taiwan), Ltd., Philips
10 da Amazonia Industria Electronica Ltda., Tatung Company of America, Inc., Hitachi, Ltd.,
11 Hitachi Asia, Ltd., Hitachi America, Ltd., Hitachi Electronics Devices (USA), Inc., Hitachi
12 Displays Ltd., Beijing Matsushita Color CRT Company, Ltd., Toshiba Corporation, Toshiba
13 American Electronic Components, Inc., Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc., Toshiba
14 America, Inc., and Toshiba America Consumer Products, L.L.C. (collectively, “Defendants”)
15 has been taken under advisement.

16
17
18 Having considered all papers filed in support of and in opposition to said
19 motion, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants’ Joint Motion to Certify Order for
20 Interlocutory Appeal is GRANTED as set forth below.

21
22 The Court hereby certifies its March 30, 2010 Order Approving and Adopting
23 Special Master’s Report, Recommendations and Tentative Rulings Regarding Defendants’
24 Motions to Dismiss for immediate appeal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) on the controlling
25 question of whether complaint allegations against “entire corporate families” state a
26 “plausible” antitrust claim within the meaning of *Bell Atlantic v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544
27 (2007) and *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S.Ct. 1937 (2009), despite the absence of specific factual
28

1 allegations linking each individual Defendant to the purported conspiracy.

2
3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 DATED: _____

5 _____
6 HON. SAMUEL CONTI
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28